DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 736 EC 170 093

AUTHOR Helmich, Edith
TITLE Summer School for the Handicapped: A Review of the Literature. Supplementary Report to "Special Education Mandates: A Preliminary Report."
INSTITUTION Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, Dept. of Planning, Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Dec 82
NOTE 23p.; For preliminary report, see ED 215 482; for related documents, see EC 170 094-095.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Eligibility; Literature Reviews; *Program Effectiveness; Research Needs; *Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois

ABSTRACT

This report analyzes the literature on the issues involved in providing summer school services to handicapped students (3-21 years old) in Illinois. Introductory sections examine the state legislative history regarding summer school and judicial decisions from across the country on the topic. A review of the literature is presented followed by analysis of the benefits resulting from summer school programs. Positive outcomes in academic, personal, and social achievement areas are reported despite a lack of rigorous empirical evidence to support such claims. Practical issues of eligibility determination and insufficient funding sources are noted. It is recommended that eligibility guidelines be incorporated in the mandate to provide summer school for handicapped children. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED247736

Supplementary Report

to

Special Education Mandates: A Preliminary Report

SUMMER SCHOOL FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Illinois State Board of Education

Edward Copeland, Chairman
State Board of Education

Donald G. Gill
Superintendent of Education

Springfield, Illinois

December, 1982

EC170093

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M Niederer
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This report was prepared by:

Edith Helmich
Research and Statistics Section
Department of Planning, Research and Evaluation

Table of Contents

I. Purpose. 1

(A) Historical Background of Summer Schools in Illinois. 1
(B) Judicial Decisions 3
(C) Objectives of this Report. 5

II. Methodology 5

III. Literature Review 6

IV. Findings. 12

Concluding Statement. 14
Recommendation. 16

References 17

SUMMER SCHOOL FOR THE HANDICAPPED:
A Review of the Literature

I. Purpose

Prior to final recommendations being implemented by the Special Education Mandates Study Task Force, this report was requested as an assurance that all current information bearing on the issues has been reviewed. This report will cover the topical issue of summer school for handicapped students within the eligible ages for elementary and secondary schools in Illinois (3 through 21 years of age).

A review of the (a) Administrative Background of Summer School in Illinois, (b) Judicial Decisions and (c) Objectives of this Report, follows:

(A) Historical Background of Summer School in Illinois

The history of summer school is not described in the literature but the development and progression of services can be observed by reviewing the enactment of legislation and administrative actions in this area.

State legislation related to summer school for special education students is fairly recent. Section 10-22.33A of The School Code was originally established as Section 10-22.33 in 1961 and allowed local school boards to establish summer classes (general) and charge tuition within prescribed limits.

Section 14-7.03 was added in 1973, and amended in 1979 to include summer school tuition on an "actual cost" basis for certain severely and profoundly handicapped children.

In 1976, Section 18-4.3 was added to establish grants for districts offering summer programs. In 1979, the section was amended to limit such grants to classes provided for handicapped children in either private school placement or those students identified as requiring extraordinary special education services.

Funding is also provided for transportation and personnel reimbursement (Article 14-13.01, (b)-(h)) under provisions including but not limited to summer school.

Thus, currently, school districts have the authority to offer summer school on a tuition basis for non-handicapped students and can receive state reimbursement (based on prescribed formulas) for certain categories of classes for handicapped student summer programs.

Additional funding is available from the federal government through P.L. 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975). Specifically, P.L. 94-142 funds are used to pay room and board costs during summer school for children in residential program placements.

Despite the minimal federal contribution (compared to state reimbursement), the requirement of a "free and appropriate" education established by P.L. 94-142 is a major force in state policy regarding the provision of summer school. Virtually all states made substantive revisions in special education regulations to effect compliance with the 1975 enactment of P.L. 94-142.

Current (1979) Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education (Article IX, 9.01, a.) require that the student be placed in an educational program appropriate to the student's needs and (Article IX, 9.18a, 4., c.) that an individualized educational plan (IEP) be developed to include a statement of the specific educational services which will be provided. If the IEP directs the provision of summer school services, current interpretation of the regulations require that an extended school year be provided at no cost to the parents. No specific criteria for summer school eligibility are required.

On the basis of these regulations, Illinois has had some problems.

Although the state has not experienced litigation on a summer school issue, twenty-six local Due Process Hearing decisions were appealed to the State Superintendent on the issue of summer school during the period February 1, 1981 through October 21, 1981. This activity prompted a formal legal opinion to be written by ISBE Legal Advisor, Julia Q. Dempsey to Superintendent of Educational Service Regions on February 17, 1981. Then, on February 27, 1981, a memorandum from the Manager of ISBE's Program Approval Section (DSES) was sent to all District and Regional Superintendents and Directors of Special Education. Both of these written communications described the issues surrounding summer school.

Local policies were judged to be secondary to the provisions of P.L. 94-142 as interpreted by judicial rulings. While the legal requirements were explained, criteria and suggested procedures to determine eligibility for summer school were not provided. Thus, despite obvious efforts to clarify the issue, the problem was not resolved for Illinois educators.

The best current short-term estimate of the cost to the state of providing summer school for handicapped students is in the range of $12-15,000,000. The numerous state funding sources identified make a more accurate estimate impossible at this time.

Stringent budgets, created by diminishing funds for education and a decline in the numbers of school age children, have forced educators to examine services and determine which ones deserve priority on the basis of demonstrated value.

Special education advocates as well as the Mandates Study Task Force, are seeking to identify those services which must be maintained by regulation. Inherent in such decisions is the necessity of determining which services can be reduced or eliminated, if necessary. A position paper written by L.D. Vuillemot (1982), Chairman of the State Special Education Advisory Board, lists summer school as a program which should be eliminated if present funding is maintained. The paper has been controversial.

With this background on the progression of summer school in mind, a consideration of the legal parameters set by the courts is needed.

(B) Judicial Decisions

An excellent summary of major court decisions across the nation on the issue of summer school is included in a report by Magliocca (1981). The relative consistency of the decisions with P.L. 94-142 represents a central concern which must be considered in any decision regarding summer school. The leading case to date has been Armstrong v. Kline, Civ. A. Nos. 78-172, 78-132, 78-133, E.D. Pennsylvania (1979), which as noted below was affirmed by the U.S. Third Circuit Court of Appeals. In Armstrong, a class action decision was rendered by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in response to a suit brought by parents of severely handicapped children, who contended that the traditional 180 day school year did not constitute a free and appropriate education pursuant to the provisions of P.L. 94-142.

The court ruled that certain handicapped children may require more than 180 days of school per year and that the state department of education and local school districts are required to provide an extended year program for those children, without cost or financial liability.

Subsequently, the Court issued Remedial Order #2, which stated in part:

> "A handicapped student is entitled to an education program in excess of 180 days per year if regression caused by interruption in educational programming, together with the student's limited recoupment capacity, render it impossible or unlikely that the student will attain the level of self-sufficiency and independence from caretakers that the student would otherwise be expected to reach in view of his/her handicapping condition."

An analysis of the U.S. Court of Appeals decision in Armstrong vs. Kline is reported by Statland and Mancuso (1981). The authors report on the decision of the U.S. Third Circuit Court of Appeals to uphold the District Court's ruling. A panel of three judges reviewed the case and affirmed that the State of Pennsylvania had prevented the proper formation of appropriate educational goals for individual handicapped children by its inflexible application of a 180 day maximum school year. This decision, written by Judge Hauter, was unanimously supported by Judge Van Dusen and Judge Sloviter. The two latter judges, however, wrote separate opinions reflecting somewhat different thinking.

Judge Van Dusen believed the plantiff class should be limited to severely and profoundly handicapped children (emotionally disturbed and retarded) who experience a recoupment/regression problem. In addition, he would have allowed the state wider latitude in restricting free appropriate public education in view of funding limitations.

Judge Sloviter disagreed with the majority's decision to restrict the ultimate goal to self-sufficiency. Her interpretation of "appropriate education" would have included a broader base of goals.

The end result of this decision is that any absolute rule denying summer school services to all handicapped children without exception cannot coexist with P.L. 94-142.

The Armstrong decision is generally recognized as an extremely important precedent because of the specific requirements and class action nature of the ruling. There are several other rulings from the Federal District Court level which deserve thoughtful consideration. The following cases are quoted from pages 11-12 of the report by Magliocca (1981):

> "In the case of In re: Richard K. (New Hampshire, 1979) the court ruled that year-round residential placement was appropriate based upon a strong recommendation for such placement found in the child's IEP. The court struck down a state standard prohibiting extended school year programs as being "arbitrary and capricious" and ordered the state to reimburse the school district for summer program tuition.
>
> In Georgia Association of Retarded Citizens v. Dr. Charles McDaniel (Georgia, 1979). The court found that the evidence did not demonstrate a substantial threat of irreparable injury since expert testimony indicated that the skills lost through regression are generally recoverable within a reasonable time.
>
> The court in Michael and Barbara Mahoney V. Administrative School District No. 1 and the Department of Education (Oregon, 1979), ruled that where the placement is necessary to meet the needs of an individual handicapped child, the school district is required to bear the tuition costs. It further ruled that this responsibility is not limited to the length of the school year. The court noted that while school districts may have some discretion over what "appropriate" means, they do not have discretion over whether appropriate programs shall be "free".
>
> In the case of [illegible] E. and Shirley A. Anderson v. Barbara Thompson (Wisconsin, 1980), [illegible]IC) cited the Armstrong v. Kline decision and concurred that a free appropriate public education may, in some cases, include year round educational programming. In the case under consideration, however, the evidence did not persuade the court that year round schooling or, indeed, any summer program would be necessary to provide a free appropriate public education at that particular time."

Summaries of court decisions often fail to sufficiently stress the individual and unique circumstances leading to the rulings. In the above cases, one can only ascertain that some handicapped children legally qualify for summer school; and, further, that any state or local law or regulation that denies the right of all handicapped children to summer school is in violation of present federal statutes which mandate the provision of a free and appropriate education.

In contrast, the Armstrong decision requires the presence of four conditions to justify mandatory provision of summer school:

1. Regression specifically caused by interruption of the educational program.

2. Limited recoupment capacity.

3. Inhibition of attainment in the areas of self-sufficiency or independence from caretakers.

4. Handicapping condition.

There is no requirement for maximum achievement or significant academic improvement for handicapped students in general. Since summer school is a service provided beyond that offered to non-handicapped students, the ruling limits application to all but a narrowly defined group.

(C) Objectives of this Report

A review and analysis of the literature will be applied to the following questions:

1. What are the benefits resulting from summer school programs?

2. What arguments are made against the provision of summer school?

3. What compelling interests require the provision of summer school?

4. What are the recommendations based on these findings?

II Methodology

In an attempt to provide a thorough coverage of the topic, numerous strategies were employed to search the current literature, identify actual practice and identify contemporary trends and theories.

A computer retrieval system was used to search the data bases in ERIC, Exceptional Children, Doctoral Dissertations and Psychological Abstracts. Several strategies, using various descriptors were applied to insure comprehensive coverage.

Documents housed within the Illinois State Board of Education were collected and analyzed for applicability to the summer school issue. In-house memorandums, committee mailings and LEA correspondence were included in this collection.

Telephone inquiries and interviews were employed to both seek out additional resources and gather information. Contact was made with the Department Chairperson of several state universities and selected university staff within special education areas. Selected professional groups such as the National Association for State Directors of Special Education and the National Council for Exceptional Children were contacted because of their collection of materials and studies reflecting current trends in special education.

The information gleaned from the above sources represents a thorough search for information relating to extended year programs for handicapped

students. Additional information may be included in material emphasizing related topics, but such references should be inconsequential when balanced against the body of information specifically relating to the extended school year.

III Literature Review

The literature is replete with publications describing summer schools for handicapped individuals. In addition, there is plentiful material of a philosophical nature and still more written in an interpretative vein to help clarify the purpose, benefit and legal basis for provision of the extended school year to handicapped students. The reports, studies and papers reported in this section include a varied collection of the above.

A study by Brown and Andrews (1969) examined the effectiveness of correlating classroom instruction with a 7 week summer camping program. Fourteen culturally disadvantaged educable mentally retarded students, ranging in age from 10.5 to 14 years, participated. Evaluation included pre and post testing with the Youth Fitness Test of the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation ard the Science Research Associates Junior Inventory. Positive results reported were enhancement of self-esteem and family status, and a reduction of the children's concept of the magnitude of their problems in the areas of reading, health and personal adjustment. Group physical fitness levels did not significantly change. Group status did not significantly change although there was some shifting of those children who occupied the middle of the sociogrametric region. Significant gains were reported in natural science knowledge.

Total living experiences were structured into a program reported by Grupp (1970). Thirty-one Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School students, aged 8 to 15 years, participated in a six-week program which included activities to enhance academic achievement, social development, cultural enrichment and basic experiences. The academic portion of the program was discontinued after three-and-one-half weeks by staff concensus. Extensive field-trip experiences (2,500 miles) were utilized to provide social and cultural enrichment through practical experience. Results reported were expanded interests in a wide variety of experiences and a "zest for living."

Results from a study conducted by Bahling (1981) found that regression was inhibited during the summer months for a carefully selected group of handicapped students from the severely/profoundly mentally retarded and severely emotionally disturbed categories. Pre and post tests showed no significant progress and no regression in eleven skill and developmental areas.

The Garden Program reported by Sendlak (1977) involved thirty-seven trainable mentally retarded students (ages not identified) in a six week summer school day program. Classes were held daily with individual student time schedules ranging from 2 to 3 hours per day. Individual student schedules were developed in the learning areas of reading, self help, prevocational training, academics, language, gardening and maintenance, audiovisual aids, music, arts and crafts. A questionnaire distributed the final week of the program was used for evaluation. In general, the students were reported to "respond quite well" and showed some improvement in displaying more independent behavior.

Results from a summer school camp for disruptive children were reported by Rawson (1973). Approximately one hundred children between the ages of six and fourteen attended the ten-day sessions in groups of twenty-four. The purpose of the camp was three-fold: research, therapy and remediation. Program emphasis stressed academic remediation and behavior modification, which were achieved through an individualized behavior prescription for each participant. Evaluation was conducted with pre and post tests developed by program staff. Results reported included an increased positive response to authority figures, gains in social self-confidence and higher academic self-ratings. Follow-up activitiy was conducted by a school social worker who visited parents twice after the beginning of the next school year. Only a few parents showed even slight interest in carrying out behavior prescriptions deemed essential to maintenance of gains acquired during the summer program. Social workers also met with each child's classroom teacher and found only about half the teachers had read the behavioral recommendations. The children whose teachers followed the recommendations showed considerable progress in both classroom conduct and academic performance. Development of free workshops for cooperating teachers and exclusion of children whose parents showed little concern for their child's program has improved maintenance of camp gains to 80% of the participants. Although, the program cost is high (not stated), the administration felt the results justified the expenditures.

Northcott (1970) reported on a dual purpose summer school in which the primary goal was to facilitate mainstreaming by enabling regular classroom teachers to gain competence and confidence in teaching hearing impaired children who would be integrated with hearing students in their classrooms. Teachers attended a one-week workshop prior to teaching in the five-week summer school. Half of the 120 summer school students were hearing impaired; half had normal hearing. Age range was not identified, but regular classroom teachers were certified at the elementary level. Student goals were stated as being improvement of self-image, acquisition of skills and knowledge and improvement in problem solving skills and strategies. The program met daily for three hours each morning for students and four hours for teachers. Title I funds were used to finance the program with tuition supplements provided by the school districts of participating students. No specific evaluation results were reported.

Another dual purpose summer school program is described by Sutaria (1979), in which learning disabled students were provided with a continuum of services and university graduate students acquired their student teaching placement requirement. Sessions for student groups were a minimum of five weeks and were conducted on a half-day basis. Students were ages four through fourteen. Evaluation was conducted through questionnaires completed by parents and graduate students. Benefits included parent s perception of increased self-confidence for the student, enhancement of student self-esteem and increased opportunities for parental involvement. Graduate students valued the student teaching opportunity and the freedom to try new ideas with students. Problems reported included some dissatisfaction with program length and parental inconvenience experienced by providing transportation and altering vacation plans. Some graduate students may have experienced atypical classroom situations, and may have lacked prior

teaching experience or been inadequately prepared. No report on achievement or performance gains was made. The program was sponsored cooperatively by a university department of special education and a local Association for Children with Learning Disabilities.

A research based conclusion regarding the effects of summer school on the academic achievement and self-concept of learning disabled children was reported by Leviton and Kiraly (1975). Thirty-five matched pairs of LD children from grades 1, 2 and 3 were randomly assigned to the experiemtnal group (summer school) or the control group. Although significant gains were documented in arithmetic following the 6 week summer program, a 6 month follow-up revealed that the differences between the two groups in arithmetic problem solving had disappeared. Self-concept significantly improved for 3rd grade subjects and for all grades combined. Other areas were not shown to have significantly improved (reading, vocabulary and comprehension).

Hourcade (1977) found that a summer camp experience emphasizing recreational activities had a significant effect on the self-concept of thirteen mildly and moderately retarded individuals ranging in age from fifteen to thirty-five years. A control group was selected at a later date. The summer program was residential and of two weeks duration. Hourcade questions the stability of the improved self-concept and suggests that the enhanced levels of self-concept may deteriorate to pre-exerimental levels contingent upon return to the pre-experimental environment.

The effectiveness of a summer program for children with severe speech handicaps is reported by Fox, et al (1967). The program included 870 students (elementary through high school) served in 26 clinics. Each participant attended a 30-minute group session daily, with individual therapy provided when needed. Evaluation consisted of ratings of pre and post tape recordings by two speech pathology experts. Questionnaires were sent to parents, teachers and program supervisors. The program was judged successful in that more than half of the students "improved" while only 20% were judged to have "poorer" speech at the program's completion. Based on sixty-one returns for the 240 questionnaires sent, parents indicated general satisfaction with the program. Teachers judged 44% of students to have made "good" progress and 43% to have made "fair" progress. Program weaknesses identified by teachers and supervisors included low parental interest, unsuitable buildings, student absenteeism, inadequate enrollment methods, large classes and selection of teachers.

The evaluation of a summer project for 110 deaf children (ages 5-14 years) is described by Minton (1976). The program consisted of half-day sessions for a period of approximately five-and-one-half weeks. Evaluation was based on successful mastery of at least one instructional objective by each participant as measured by pre and post criterion-referenced tests in reading and mathematics. Ninety percent of participants mastered at least one reading objective and 72 percent mastered one mathematics objective. Results were considered very postive in view of the multiple handicaps present to some degree in the student group, i.e., emotional disturbance and mental retardation. Transportation problems were serious and delayed onset of the program for many participants and precluded the use of field trips as part of the instructional program. The author cautions that results are tempered by the fact that the instructors who taught for mastery are the same people who tested for mastery.

Spivack and Kasky (1972) reported on a large, broad-based program for 502 socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed children at both elementary and secondary levels. Facilities participating included eight private day and residental schools, one residential public prison program and three mental hospital schools. The six-week program varied from three and one half to five hours per day depending on individual facilities, with the five hour programs terminating before the others. Program emphasis was academic and behavioral. Evaluation was based on teacher ratings and student ratings. Results were highly positive in the academic achievement areas with increased achievement for those students attending eighteen or more sessions. In social and emotional development, students who attended eighteen or more sessions demonstrated an improved T score on the Jesness Inventory. A sampling of the elementary population rated 56.6% as improved in social and emotional functioning; 41.5% as remaining the same; and 1.9% as regressing. No data were provided for secondary participants. Conclusions recommended that the program be recycled the following year with recommendations predominately directed toward improved administration and operation of the program.

A series of three studies was conducted on a New York City sumer school: Chorast (1975) reported on a program for 506 elementary and secondary students in the following exceptionalities: Severely Emotionally Handicapped, Hearing Handicapped, Multiply Handicapped, and Multiple Learning Disorders. The five-week program included academic and recreational components with evaluation based on each student successfully mastering one instructional objective as measured by criterion-referenced pre and post testing. The program results indicated more than 90% of the children in each category mastered one or more objectives. Weaknesses reported include late starting date, transportation problems, absenteeism and lack of a narrative report on each child for transfer to the receiving teacher in the fall. Abordo (1975) reported on a two-month reading and mathematics program for Title I handicapped youngsters in the following exceptionalities: Neurologically Impaired-Emotionally Handicapped, Emotionally Handicapped, Neurologically Impaired and/or Severely Physically Handicapped, and included demonstration classes for Emotionally Handicapped and Neurologically Impaired. Title I elgibility criteria was used for selection and evaluation was based on each student successfully completing one instructional objective as measured by criterion-referenced pre and post testing. Program results indicated that more than 70% of the children in each category mastered one or more objectives. Weaknesses reported include a lack of expertise in teachers' ability to use criterion-referenced tests effectively, late starting date, transportation difficulties, more heterogeneous grouping and the need for better class sites. Miller (1975) reported on a reading and mathematics program for 377 speech/language impaired students and 315 mentally retarded students. The program was conducted for six weeks. Speech/Language Impaired students met for 30 minutes daily. Mentally Retarded students met daily (time not given). Reported results indicate that the Speech/language program did not meet the goals set and a concern was expressed as to whether speech functioning has an impact on academic functioning. The results for the mentally retarded

group were very positive with 88% of participants mastering at least one instructional objective. A concern expressed was the restricted achievement caused by insufficient instructional levels. The program was largely social-recreational in design.

The Ohio Department of Education (1980) studied the "state of the art" in the provision of summer school by reviewing judicial decisions (particularly Armstrong v. Kline) and conducted a nationwide survey to determine the extent of summer school services, funding sources and degree of regulation. Results showed wide variation in all areas. Eligibility criteria is required in nine states: California, Kansas, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, New York, Michigan, Wyoming, Virginia and Massachusetts. Two administrative issues identified for the extended school year were teacher contracts and appropriation procedures.

An argument for the extended school year for all children is offered by Crim (1974). School buildings which are unoccupied during summer months are judged to be a waste of public funds. The author argues that most children would benefit from the pleasant environment and stimulating activities inherent in summer schools. A major cost-effective point of view is that the possibility of earlier graduation would be of benefit both to students and society by enhancing the possibility of post-secondary education or training.

The issue of summer school from an attorney's viewpoint is discussed in a article by Leonard (1981). An overview of court decisions is presented to support the contention that the IEP has been recognized as the decisive factor in determining when an appropriate education requires more than 180 days of schooling per year. The author examined the concerns identified by parents of handicapped children and special education teachers. Her conclusions, in brief, contend that education is the role of the school rather than of the parents of handicapped children; that special summer programs are funded for non-handicapped students, i.e., Title I; and that teachers cannot be held accountable for gains if the same gains are made repeatedly. The issue of generalization is dismissed as being ineffective in the absence of controlled environment and active communication between parents and program staff. Possibilities for opportunities to function outside school are given as part-time school, weekends at home and other short breaks. Denial of the opportunity for an extended school is, in the author's opinion, discriminatory for some children.

A "different" view of the extended school year for handicapped minority students was expressed in a paper by Marshall (1981), presented at the Council for Exceptional Children Conference on the Exceptional Black Child. Emphasis was placed on the beneficial aspects of allowing students to be a part of the "real world" during summer months and charges that extending the school year is discriminatory and an attempt to exclude handicapped students from their right to be a visible part of society. The author further pointed out that P.L. 94-142 now provides a possible eight additional years of schooling for handicapped students (birth to age 21) as compared to regular education students (ages 5-1/2 to 18). The author charges the twelve month school year with being a socially expendient form of incarceration and urges the development and utilization of community agency services outside of education to meet the needs of those students who need services during the summer months.

A study by Cook and Schwartz (1969) examined four special education assumptions as applied to 149 (ages 7 to 13 years) educable mentally retarded students. The first assumption was that regression occurs during the summer. Spring and fall testing showed no academic regression and revealed significant gains in reading scores. The second assumption was that students attending a one month summer school would show greater achievement during the summer than those who were not in school. Mean scores were significantly higher for summer school participants, but the researchers point out that the summer school students were predominately female and girls in this age range consistently achieve better than boys. (The third and fourth assumptions dealt with teacher change and absences and are not directly pertinent to this report.) Since no significant loss of skills was observed over the summer months for out-of-school EMR students, the researchers suggest that teachers may be experiencing a lack of discipline and loss of work skills rather than academic regression in the fall.

Traditional learning theory as summarized in a technical report prepared by the New York State Education Department, Division of Research (1978), would support the "summer regression" claims of those who advocate the importance of summer school for the handicapped. However, the regression was found to be dependent on many factors and it is prevalent among regular as well as handicapped students. Although regression was established, there was little evidence to support the premise that current summer school programs have a significant effect on long-term achievement. Program design, teacher competency and instructional approach have been shown to have an impact on the amount of regression during the 180-day school year. Thus, the paper concluded that without careful instructional coordination of summer school with the regular year program, the growth in achievement or performance may represent "new gains" and have little or no effect on regression for areas represented in the regular year program.

Issues that are vital to the development of extended school year programs are proposed in an article by Larsen, Goodman and Glean (1981). The authors dismiss arguments opposing summer programs on the basis of court decisions which have established the legal mandate to provide such programs when the need is documented. Administrative procedures for selection of eligible students, program coordination, data collection and funding are recommended with the burden of such tasks being assigned to educators. Key issues include the development of definitive eligibility criteria and coordination of objectives for the summer and regular year programs. Eligibility criteria is recommended to include three variables: type of handicapping condition, evidence of a regression/recoupment disability, and the goal of self-sufficiency. The authors maintain that data collection should accompany all steps of the procedure to determine which students are eligible for extended year programming and be of sufficient quantity and quality to insure substantiation of eligibility and effective program benefits as reflected by documented long-range achievement gains.

Edgar, Spence and Kenowitz (1977) reported on the research available to support the benefits of summer school for handicapped children and offered suggestions which outline an evaluation plan to determine whether or not extended school year programs are successful. Their findings concluded that

no evidence existed at that time to support long-range benefits resulting from summer programs. They proposed an evaluation plan which included achievement and/or performance data for the previous year, gains recorded for summer programs and follow-up data spanning the course of the next school year until a full year's achievement record could be established. Data required would include types of handicapped students, length of summer program, instructional staff, measurement procedures, and temporal measurement. The conclusion reached was that informed decisions regarding the impact of extended year programs can only be made when such studies are available.

IV. Findings

These findings attempt to summarize the literature in a narrative which will provide answers to the questions proposed in the Purpose statement of this report:

1. What are the benefits resulting from summer school programs?

2. What arguments are made against the provision of summer school?

3. What compelling interests require the provision of summer school?

4. What are the recommendations based on these findings?

The reports on programs overwhelmingly reveal positive outcomes in academic, personal or social achievement areas. While the accuracy and sincerity of the gains reported are not being questioned, emphasizing this type of research results in a particular type of bias since there is little motivation to report the unsuccessful program elements. Evaluation methods vary dramatically but predominately consist of subjective judgment or teacher developed criterion referenced testing. When evaluation is conducted by the same group responsible for the program, a vested interest in outcome is inherent in the evaluators. This weakness is found in the reports by Brown and Andrews (1969), Grupp (1970), Sendlak (1977), Northcott (1970), Sutaria (1979), Fox, et.al. (1967), and Minton (1976).

Inconsistency in program design also makes it difficult to draw conclusions. None of the program reports stated a rationale for either the length of the program by weeks or hours per day. Variation ranged from 24-hour residential camp programs, Brown and Andrews (1969), to 30-minute daily sessions, Fox, et.al. (1967). There is no apparent consensus as to what constitutes an effective summer school in terms of instructional time.

Program content is simularly discrepant. While most programs offer an academic component, activities designed to enhance self-concept are prevalent. Only one study, Fox, et.al. (1967), identified the instructional time devoted to a particular subject area.

Coordination with regular school year programs was seldom addressed. Those articles which did recogize the importance of continuity and coordination included Rawson (1973), Northcott (1970), Larsen, Goodman and Glean (1981) and the New York State Education Department, Division of Research (1978). A finding common to all of these reports was that gains experienced in summer school required reinforcement during the school year to prevent regression.

Gains which are "unique", i.e., not directly related to either the prior or forthcoming school year, were generally considered temporary and not of long-term benefit.

The literature does not attempt to define regression or recoupment time in quantitative terms. Only one study, Cook and Swartz, reported on the results of research designed to document the extent of regression. In that instance, no evidence of summer regression was found for EMR students. A single study, Leviton and Kiraly (1975), was found to examine the recoupment time factor for LD students. Their study reported no difference between summer school participants and a matched control group when a six-month follow-up was conducted. Summer gains had not been retained and the out-of-school summer group functioned at comparable levels.

Despite these studies, there is a research base of learning theory to support the belief that regression does occur during the summer for non-handicapped as well as handicapped children, New York State Education Department Division of Research (1978). The extent of regression and fall recoupment time, however, is not known. There is also a lamentable lack of evidence to support the premise of long-term gains as a result of the extended school year. Edgar, Spence and Kenowitz (1977), and Magliocca (1981) found no evidence to support long-range benefits resulting from summer school.

The lack of evidence to support the benefits of summer school runs counter to strong beliefs held by teachers and parents of handicapped children. Throughout the literature, these two groups represent the major advocacy groups for the provision of summer school. It is a delicate subject, but the existence of a vested interest for both groups needs consideration. One cannot ignore the summer employment opportunities afforded to teachers when summer schools are offered. Also, parents are relieved of child care responsibilities during the time summer programs are in session. These observations do not attempt to deny the primarily child-centered motives of summer school advocates, but such factors must be eliminated from the rationale for public summer school programs.

One paper that stands alone in viewpoint was presented to a national group of special educators. Marshall (1981) accused society of denying handicapped children of their right to visibility and participation in the real world by incarcerating them in extended year programs. Denying handicapped children the opportunity of generalizing their school achievement to practical non-school experiences was judged to be discriminatory. This rather harsh accusation should not be taken lightly and is, perhaps, a consideration which is uncomfortable.

Increase in demand for summer school over a 3 year period is illustrated by data obtained from ISBE's Department of Specialized Educational Services. Figures were consolidated to show only statewide totals:

Number of Districts Submitting Applications for Summer School

	1979	1980	1981
Number of School Districts	366	460	667
% of Change		+26%	+45%

The number of students attending summer school programs is not available at this time. However, it is apparent that any change in the current mandate will cause approximately 667 districts to reappraise their current practice of selecting students for extended year programs. The availability of funds is a critical issue in this determination. In the absence of evidence to support claims of shorter fall recoupment times or long-term benefits, will districts continue to provide summer school at no cost to special education students when regular education students are either denied the summer school opportunity or charged tuition? The fear in the community of special educators is that programs will deteriorate to the point of failing to provide appropriate services. After years of advocacy in behalf of handicapped students, many special educators and parents are suspicious of the willingness of the educational system to continue a full continuum of services in the absence of mandates.

From a legal perspective, there is ample evidence that the judicial system will require school districts to provide summer school for severely/profoundly handicapped students if the IEP indicates a compelling need for an extended school year. Stratland and Macuso (1981) analyze the implications of Armstrong vs. Kline and conclude that any absolute rule limiting services to all handicapped children cannot coexist with P.L. 94-142. Leonard (1981), reporting from the perspective of an attorney specializing in educational law, also concluded that denial of opportunity for an extended school year is discriminatory.

The questions now become practical. How should educators determine eligibility for summer school? And how can current summer school programs be designed in such a way that long-term benefits can be validated by objective means? Larsen, Goodman and Glean (1981) present a structured system for the development of eligibility criteria and program design. Similar recommendations are made by Edgar, Spence and Kenowitz (1977), and The New York State Education Department, Division of Research (1978). The general procedure recommended by the groups are also advocated by Rawson (1973). In essence, the above literature rejects the provision and design of summer school based on assumptions and calls for a comprehensive research based model.

This point of view was reaffirmed in the course of telephone interviews with Special Education Department Chairpersons of Illinois universities and university staff. A general lament was the lack of empirical research. Dr. Robert Henderson of the University of Illinois, maintained that research was seriously hindered by current laws. There is a need for provisions to be developed which would allow for the longitudinal studies which could provide answers to vital questions concerning the benefits (or lack thereof) of summer school.

Concluding Statement

The findings indicate a lack of substantive evidence to support the benefit resulting from summer school for handicapped children. After reviewing the results reported by summer school programs, there is little information present to demonstrate meaningful achievement or performance gains. The lack of data to support long-term gain is a serious weakness, for without such benefit, summer school becomes an expensive supplemental program which

is not fundamental to the educational process. At the same time, there is recognition of the legal requirement to provide summer school services for certain handicapped children.

The dilemma is compounded by insufficient funding sources, accompanied by increased demand for summer school programs. If sufficient funds were available, the questions of documented value would not gain prominence, i.e., summer school may help prevent regression and may accelerate achievement by eliminating recoupment time; summer school probably does not have negative effects.

In the face of such uncertainty, the mandate for summer school should be limited to those students for whom a need can be documented by evidence of regression, limited recoupment ability, future attainment of self-sufficiency or freedom from caretakers and, of course, the presence of a handicapping condition. This establishment of criteria for eligibility would follow the lead of the ten states reported by the Ohio Department of Education (1980). Concurrently, research should be encouraged in the areas required for eligibility in order to facilitate progressively more effective selection procedures. Additional research should be encouraged and, if possible, financially supported, in the areas of program design, content and the impact of summer school on long-term achievement gains.

Recommendation

1. This report finds evidence to recommend modification of the mandate for summer school written as a part of the IEP.

Comment Inasmuch as judicial decisions seem to preclude the practicality of avoiding the issue of summer school for handicapped students by removing the mandate inherent in present interpretation of the IEP, provisions for student eligibility guidelines must be a part of the mandate. Eligibility criteria for summer school should clearly focus on educational needs in accordance with federal court rulings and be documented in a manner recommended by the Illinois State Board of Education.

Comment ISBE should encourage research in the areas of regression, recoupment time, long-term benefits and model programs at the Illinois institutions of higher learning and, if legally possible, grant special exceptions to prevailing regulations to allow for the development of longitudinal empirical research.

References

Abardo, Enrique, J., "Summer Program of Reading and Mathematics for Handicapped Pupils in Special Education Classes (Neurologically Impaired-Emotionally Handicapped, Emotionally Handicapped-A and B classes, Neurologically Impaired and/or Severely Physically Handicapped, and the Demonstration Classes for the Teacher Training Institute)." Evaluation Report, New York City Board of Education. Summer, 1975.

Bahling, Elizabeth, "Extended School Year Program, Intermediate Unit, No. 5". Paper presented at the Annual International Convention of The Council for Exceptional Children (59th, New York, N.Y., April 12-17, 1981).

Brown, Louis F. and Andrews, James B., "A Summer School Outdoor Educational Program for Culturally Disadvantaged Educable Mentally Retarded Children." University of Iowa, Iowa City (Project No. G-8648). 1968.

Chorost, Sherwood B., "Summer Program for Reading and Mathematics for Handicapped Pupils in Special Education Classes (DSEPPS) (Severely Emotionally Handicapped, Hearing Impaired, Multiply Handicapped, Pre-Placement)." Evaluation Report, New York City Board of Education. Summer, 1975.

Cook, John J. and Schwartz, Robert H., "A Look at Some Assumptions in Special Education." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, V-4, #4, Dec., 1969, pp. 149-157,.

Crim, Roger D., "Extended School Year Programs: The Effects on Achievement and Other Phases of Student's Lives." U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Education. December, 1974.

Edgar, Eugene and Spence, Wayne M. and Kenowitz, Leonard A., "Extended School Year for the Handicapped: Is It Working?" The Journal of Special Education, V. 11, #4, pp. 441-447. 1977.

Fox, David J., et. al., "Summer 1967 Clinics for Speech Handicapped Children. Evaluation of New York City Title I Educational Projects 1966-67." New York City Board of Education. November, 1967.

Grupp, James W. "2,500 Miles of Experiences: Summer School at IBSSS." Education of the Visually Handicapped, V2, #2, May, 1970, pp. 55-7.

Hourcade, Jack, "Effect of a Summer Camp Program on Self-Concept of Mentally Retarded Young Adults." Paper presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children (55th, Atlanta, Georgia, April 11-15, 1977).

Larsen, Larry and Goodman, Libby and Glean, Richard, "Issues in the Implementation of Extended School Year Programs for Handicapped Students." Exceptional Children, V. 47, #4, January, 1981, pp. 256-263.

New York State, Education Department, Albany Division of Research, "Learning, Retention and Forgetting" Technical Report #5, Nov., 1978.

Leonard, Judith, "180 Day Barrier: Issues and Concerns." Exceptional Children, V. 47, #4, January, 1981, pp. 246-53.

Leviton, Harvey and Kiraly, John Jr., "Summer Compensatory Education: Effects on Learning Disabled Children." Exceptional Children, V. 42, #1, September, 1975, pp. 48-49.

Magliocca, Larry A. and Barker, Hal, (Tri-State Midwest Report) "Research Review and Recommendations Regarding Extended School Year Programming for Handicapped Pupils." Report to Joseph Fisher, ISBE. Aug. 1981.

Marshall, Wylamerle Glover, "Social and Practical Implications of Requests for Twelve Months Schooling for Minority Handicapped Students." Paper presented at The Council for Exceptional Black Child (New Orleans, LA, February, 1981.)

McCarthy, Martha M., "Judicial Interpretations of What Constitutes Appropriate Educational Programs for Handicapped Children." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Educational Research Association (1981).

Miller, Martin B., "Summer Program of Reading and Mathematics for Handicapped Pupils in Special Education Classes: Speech/Language Impaired Pupils and Mentally Retarded Pupils." Evaluation Report, New York City Board of Education. Summer, 1975.

Minton, Judith, "Summer 1976 Program for Deaf Children: Evaluation Report." New York City Board of Education. 1976.

Northcott, Winifred N. "An Experimental Summer School: Impetus for Successful Integration." Volta Review, V72, #8, Nov., 1970, pp. 498-507.

Ohio Department of Education, Division of Special Education, "The Extended School Year for the Handicapped." May, 1980.

Rawson, Harve E. "Academic Remediation and Behavior Modification in a Summer School Camp: Elementary School Journal, V74, #1, Oct., 1973, pp. 34-43.

Sendlak, David J. "The Garden Program." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, V12, #2, April, 1977, pp. 124-127.

Spivack, Freida and Kosky, Elizabeth, "Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed Children." Final Report, New York City Board of Education. Summer, 1972.

Stotland, Janet F. and Mancuso, Ellen, "U.S. Court of Appeals Decision Regarding Armstrong V. Kline: The 180 Day Rule." Exceptional Children V. 47, #4, January, 1981, pp. 266-270.

Sutaria, Saroj: "A Summer Program for Children with Learning Disabilities". Journal of Learning Disabilities, V12, #3, March, 1979, pp. 58-60.

Thomas, Margaret A. and Reese, Susan J. "Making Programmatic Decisions During a Time of Fiscal Retrenchment: The Case of Related Services for Handicapped Youth." U.S. Department of Education, N1881-ED, (See pp. 19 and 45), July, 1982.

ISBE and LEA Documents

L.D. Vuillemot, Chairman, memorandum to State Advisory council members. "The Time is Now!". Dated 10-12-82.

Memorandum to District and Regional Superintendents and Directors of Special Education form Gail Lieberman. "1981 Summer School Extended Year Programs for Handicapped Children; Applications Due May 1, 1981" Dated 2-27-81.

Memorandum to Superintendents of Educational Service Regions from Julia Quinn Dempsey. "Provision of Summer Schools for Handicapped Students." Dated 2-17-81.

Monthly Reports on State Level Appeals, "Memoranda to Illinois State Advisory Council on Special Education from ISBE Legal Department.

LMP1606h